NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

BRADLEY LIVINGSTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUDGE ANTHONY GALLINA, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 24-8862 (SDW) (CLW)

WHEREAS OPINION & ORDER

June 2, 2025

WIGENTON, District Judge.

THIS MATTER having come before this Court upon Plaintiff Bradley Livingston's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Reconsideration (D.E. 85 ("Motion")) of this Court's May 8, 2025 Opinion granting Defendants' the Honorable Anthony Gallina, J.M.C. – Elmwood Park and the Borough of Elmwood Park's Motion to Dismiss and dismissing Plaintiff's Amended Complaint with prejudice (D.E. 83); and

WHEREAS to succeed on a motion for reconsideration, the movant must demonstrate at least one of the following: "(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; or (3) the need to correct clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice." Wiest v. Lynch, 710 F.3d 121, 128 (3d Cir. 2013) (quoting Lazaridis v. Wehmer, 591 F.3d 666, 669 (3d Cir. 2010)). Plaintiff fails to present any arguments identifying a valid basis for reconsideration; therefore

Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**.

/s/ Susan D. Wigenton SUSAN D. WIGENTON, U.S.D.J.

Orig: Clerk cc: Parties

Cathy L. Waldor, U.S.M.J.